(3)

3

Scott, afterwards Scott Waring (John) Major

MAJOR SCOTT's LETTERS TO Mr. FRANCIS,

IN

REPLY TO HIS PAMPHLET,

ENTITLED

The STATE of INDIA.

The following LETTERS *were written in reply to Mr.* FRANCIS's *Pamphlet, entitled,* "STATE OF INDIA, *&c.*" *but as they were only publiſhed in the Daily Papers, I have collected them for the information of the Proprietors. The* REPORTS *of the* SECRET COMMITTEE, *and the* OPINION *of the* HOUSE *of* COMMONS, *will now, I truſt, ſoon determine, that neither the Maratta War, nor the Invaſion of the Carnatic, can be imputed to Mr.* HASTINGS. *His ſentiments, and the ſentiments of the Court of Directors upon the meaſures which brought on the Maratta War, have been uniformly the ſame.*

IN the Court of Proprietors which was held on the 27th of March, ſeveral very ſevere reflections were (as I thought) caſt upon Mr. Haſtings, for having furniſhed his private Agent in England, with copies of certain papers relative to the affairs of Bengal. This proceeding of the Governor-General was ſaid to be contrary to poſitive orders, and prejudicial to the Company's intereſts. A converſation enſued, but as there was a very thin Court at the time, I now beg leave to ſtate to the Proprietors at large, what I then ſaid upon the ſubject.

The day after the arrival of the firſt Members of the Supreme Council in Bengal, an oppoſition commenced—and in leſs than a month, a ſeparate letter of appeal was ſent to England by the majority. Mr. Haſtings was obliged, in his own defence, to adopt this mode of addreſſing the Court of Directors—and as a matter of courſe, when the attack was ſo perſonal, both parties, I ſuppoſe, ſent copies of their letters to their particular connections in England. It is well known that the letters of the majority were filled with the moſt melancholy repreſentations of the ſtate of the Company's affairs in Bengal. Stronger language indeed cannot now be uſed, when unfortunately our circumſtances are greatly changed. The contents of theſe ſeveral letters were very public, but I never heard that any objection was ſtarted to their being made ſo. In March or April, 1781, a pamphlet was publiſhed, entitled, "Origin of the Maratta War, &c. &c." It was made up of mutilated extracts from the proceedings of the Governor-General and Council in *their ſecret department*. Will the author declare from whom he received his materials? Mr. Joſeph Price, whoſe character was reflected upon in this publication, has very fairly called upon the author to avow himſelf, both in the public papers, and in a letter addreſſed to Mr. Francis. I know but two modes of procuring the documents which he made uſe of. Either from one of the Members of Government in Bengal, or by an act of infidelity of ſome perſon who at that time had acceſs to the ſecret records. The compliments laviſhed upon Mr. Francis throughout this work are not more conſpicuous than the abuſe ſo illiberally beſtowed upon Mr. Haſtings.

Mr. Francis has avowed himſelf to be the author of an anonymous pamphlet publiſhed in January laſt. It contains the copy of a letter from the Nabob of Oude, and other materials extracted from the ſecret records of the Government of Bengal. Was any notice taken of this publication, either by the Court of Directors, or by any individual Director? Mr. Haſtings was pleaſed to nominate me his private Agent in England. He

 ſignified

ſignified this appointment to the Chairman of the Court of Directors.—The principal motive for my appointment was, that I might be upon the ſpot to obviate as far as my knowledge enabled me to do ſo, any miſrepreſentation of his public conduct. Mr. Haſtings tranſmitted to me a packet of papers under the care of Mr. Grady, a gentleman who had taken his paſſage on board the Neptune Indiaman. That ſhip ſprung a leak, and could not proceed on her voyage. Mr. Grady wrote from the ſhip to Mr. Haſtings, to know what he ſhould do with the packet entruſted to his care, but not having time to receive an anſwer, he ſhifted it on board the Belmont, in which ſhip he came home, and delivered it to me on his arrival in London. The Company's ſervant who diſpatched theſe ſhips, did not chooſe to ſhift the packets of the Neptune into the Belmont without orders, and it would have been dangerous to delay the Belmont until he received an order from Calcutta. The conſequence was, that I very unexpectedly received ſome very partial extracts of the Neptune's diſpatches. Let it be obſerved, that my papers were embarked on board the Neptune, and ſhifted without Mr. Haſtings's knowledge. I hope therefore, he will now be acquitted of an intention to withold from the Company that information which he communicated to his private Agent. The moment I heard that the Court of Directors had not received the documents alluded to, I wrote to the Chairman, and begged to lay them before the Court.—I conceived this to be my duty, and I knew very well that Mr. Haſtings was anxious to have his diſpatches made as public as poſſible. The reform which he had made in the mode of collecting the revenues, would naturally ſubject him to much odium. Is it therefore to be conceived that he would purpoſely withold thoſe reaſons which had induced him to adopt a meaſure ſo hurtful, to the intereſts of individuals? The next diſpatches will prove whether the advantages to the Company from this alteration, and from the proviſion of ſalt, are likely to amount to the annual ſum of ſix hundred and ninety thouſand pounds.

It has been obſerved, that I have made my diſpatches public—that I have printed a letter from Dewagur Pundit to Mr. Haſtings. I avow it—I conceive I had a right to do ſo—The opponents of Mr. Haſtings have made no ſcruple to print anonymouſly, the ſevereſt reflections upon his public and private character. The News-papers have been filled with "Extracts of private Letters from Calcutta," deſcribing our affairs to be in a deplorable ſituation' Shall I be blamed during this unhappy party contention, for defending my principal to the utmoſt of my ſlender abilities, or for attempting to give confidence and hope to the proprietors, in oppoſition to the gloomy repreſentations that are continually made to them? Mr. Haſtings anxiouſly wiſhes for, hopes, and expects a peace with the Marattas. When he diſapproved of the defenſive ſyſtem at Bombay, it was becauſe he thought an appearance of vigour at ſuch a critical period would tend to accelerate that event which he ſo earneſtly deſired. Our next advices muſt determine this point.

Mr. Haſtings has now been above two-and-thirty years in the Company's ſervice. Before he ſucceeded to the government which he has now held ten years, he filled ſome of the moſt important ſtations in India. In 1775 he was accuſed of having amaſſed a fortune of four hundred thouſand pounds in thirty months, by acts of rapacity and peculation. No proofs were brought of the fact. The firmneſs and virtue of the independent proprietors preſerved him in his ſtation in 1776, when, as it is well known,

the

the whole force of the Government in this country was exerted to effect his removal from it.

Mr. Haſtings's fortune for a man in his ſtation is known to be a very moderate one, very conſiderably leſs than eighty thouſand pounds—yet it has been aſſerted that he is in poſſeſſion of a large property upon the Continent of Europe. This is moſt ſolemnly and publicly denied. No man who knows Mr. Haſtings's moderation—his conſtant diſregard to his private intereſt, can poſſibly give credit to an aſſertion ſo injurious to his reputation—and a generous public will ſurely heſitate before they adopt as a fact, a declaration unaccompanied with proofs of any kind whatever, although ſuch proofs have been repeatedly and earneſtly called for.

JOHN SCOTT.

LETTER I.

To PHILIP FRANCIS, *Eſq.*

SIR,

You will, I hope, excuſe me for making this the channel of reply to a pamphlet, intitled, "The State of India*," which is either written by yourſelf, or under your immediate directions; the time choſen for the publication of it, immediately before the meeting of Parliament, leaves me no other mode.

Why Mr. Haſtings's letter to the Directors of the 2d December, 1780, is now publiſhed, I know not. The inveſtment has not been ſtopped, or even reduced; but ſurely, as we were circumſtanced at that time, Mr. Haſtings acted prudently in preparing the Directors for an event which might have happened.

I am equally at a loſs to account for the publication of Aſſolph-ul-Dowlah's letter of the 19th November, 1779. You, Sir, well know the real cauſes of the impoveriſhed ſtate of Oude. Will you ſtate to the Houſe of Commons the great ſupply of ſpecie brought to Calcutta from that country, and its formerly dependant province Benares, ſince the extenſion of our influence by Mr. Haſtings's negociation with the late Vizur in 1773? If you do this, the diſtreſs of a country, with little foreign trade, and without mines, for the want of circulating ſpecie, will at once be accounted for. In your letter to the Directors, of the 29th November, 1781, you ſay the Vizier's country is irretrievably ruined. Perhaps, Sir, you may recollect a converſation which I had the honour to hold with you in Calcutta, in April, 1781. You then were pleaſed to make a ſimilar declaration to me. You affirmed to me, that our forces ſtationed in Oude, could no longer be paid from its revenues.—Yet, Sir, they were paid to the December following, five lacks of roupees were ſent in ſpecie from Lucknow to Calcutta, and Mr. Middleton, when he took charge of his office, ſupplied Colonel Camac's detachment with caſh.

The

* Vide State of India, printed for J. Debrett.

The Governor-General and yourſelf have already urged every thing that can be ſaid on the ſubject of the Maratta war in your ſeveral minutes, and theſe will doubtleſs be laid before the Houſe of Commons. You inſinuate that Mr. Haſtings now wiſhes to throw his portion of guilt in the Maratta war upon his neighbours. You well know, Sir, that Mr Haſtings is as much a ſtranger to political as to perſonal fear. It would be improper in me, only two days before the meeting of Parliament, to enter upon a ſubject which the Secret Committee is ſo much more able to inveſtigate thoroughly, nor will time, or the bounds of ſuch a publication as this, permit it. For the preſent, therefore, I ſhall barely ſtate a few facts.

On the 23d January, 1778, Mr. Haſtings brought before the Board a plan, by which, if carried into execution, he hoped to put an effectual ſtop to the diſputes between the gentlemen of Bombay and the Marattas. On the 28th of January, whilſt this minute lay for conſideration, the Bombay letter, of the 12th December, 1777, arrived at Calcutta.—The Bombay plan was adopted by the majority of the Supreme Council. The Directors were fully informed of every ſtep taken in Bengal. Your objections, and Mr. Wheler's were at the ſame time before them.—Theſe advices were received in London, on the 26th July, 1778, on the 1ſt September following, Colonel Capper was diſpatched over land with letters to Bombay and Bengal, ſtrongly approving the meaſures of both Preſidencies. The firſt general letter, of 1779, contained a repetition of their approbation in ſtrong terms, for the very reaſons aſſigned by Mr. Haſtings, the neceſſity of counteracting the French intrigues at Poona. *Upon this very principle*, Mr. Haſtings propoſed to enter into a treaty with the Raja of Berar, when he ſuppoſed, and with great reaſon, that the Gentlemen of Bombay had relinquiſhed their plan in favour of Ragoba, and when we had received intelligence, that war with France was actually declared, this negociation failed. The cauſe is fully explained in the minutes which will be laid before the Houſe of Commons. The ſubſequent events are well known: but, Sir, there is one declaration of yours which, I confeſs, aſtoniſhes me. That on the 24th May, 1779, it was Mr. Haſtings's object to precipitate a third rupture with the Marattas. I am at a loſs to conceive what foundation you can have for this aſſertion. Mr. Haſtings, I believe, upon my honour, did anxiouſly wiſh to accommodate our differences with the Marattas, upon the terms of Colonel Upton's treaty, and he looked to that event, *as the termination of all his political views on the Malabar coaſt*. The expreſſion was his own, but he ſpoke the ſentiments of every member of the Board. What happened? the Marrattas peremptorily required us to give up the perſon of Ragoba, and to cede Salſettee to them. Did you or Mr. Wheler propoſe to make ſuch conceſſions to avoid the war?

Why Mr. Haſtings, in June, 1780, wiſhed to purſue a different conduct towards Madjie Sindea, from that which he profeſſed in May, 1779, will appear by reading thoſe minutes which brought on the unfortunate diſputes between you and Mr. Haſtings. Theſe minutes will ſoon appear in public.

Mr. Haſtings has explained his reaſons to the Directors for advancing three lacks of roupees to the army of Moodagee Booſla. If his reaſons are not ſatisfactory, the Directors know, and will, of courſe, take proper meaſures in conſequence? the whole of this tranſaction will ſhew Mr. Haſtings's purity as well as ſkill. I will add, that the man whom you call the Go-

vernor-

vernor-general's authoriſed Agent, has nothing to conceal from the Secret Committee, but will at all times be ready to anſwer any queſtions they may be pleaſed to put to him.

Nizam Ally Cawn's reſentment to us, was not in Bengal attributed to any other cauſe than that aſſigned by the Governor-general, the demand by the government of Fort St. George, that he ſhould give up the arrears and future payment of the rent ſtipulated by the treaty of 1768, and their taking poſſeſſion of the Guntoor Circar, I always underſtood you were then of the ſame opinion. This, however, is a point which muſt ſoon be cleared beyond a doubt.

You ſay, Sir, that Mr. Francis, and Mr. Wheler had no perſonal enmity to Sir Thomas Rumbold—do you mean to imply, that Mr. Haſtings, in his public conduct to him, was influenced by any perſonal motives? I do aſſert that Mr. Haſtings could have no perſonal motives to gratify. On the contrary, he always expreſſed himſelf much obliged to Sir Thomas Rumbold, for ſupporting him very honourably at a moſt critical period, when that gentleman had a ſeat in the direction.

You ſay, Mr. Haſtings is ſupported by a powerful party in England, &c. This circumſtance is ſurely highly to his honour. He was an unconnected individual when he was ſtruck at in 1776, he was then ſupported by independent proprietors, convinced of his ability and integrity; he is now ſupported by ſome of the moſt reſpectable characters in the kingdom, convinced of that ability and integrity. Can ſtronger proofs of ſuperior merit exiſt? Do you deny Mr. Haſtings the credit of providing the funds for diſcharging the bond debt in the firſt year of the adminiſtration of the Supreme Council? Would it not have been diſcharged if the old adminiſtration had continued?

Many illiberal and inflammatory paragraphs have been publiſhed in newſpapers reſpecting Mr. Haſtings; it would be an endleſs taſk to reply to them all, but there is one very ſerious accuſation contained in the extract of a letter from Calcutta, dated the 15th January, 1781, and publiſhed in the Morning Intelligencer of the 11th January, 1782.

"That Mr. Haſtings had remitted conſiderable ſums to Europe through the Dutch Company." Of all ground of accuſation, this is the laſt I could ſuppoſe could have been taken, either as to the quantity or manner of remittance. If you know of ſuch, I requeſt you will lay the whole tranſaction before the public.

I have the honour to be,

SIR,

Your moſt obedient humble ſervant,

JOHN SCOTT.

To PHILIP FRANCIS, *Esq.*

SIR,

FOR the reasons mentioned in my former letter, I shall continue to address any remarks I may have to make on its subject to you.

The politics of India have opened a wide field for controversy, in which you took a very early and decided part against Mr. Hastings, and in which so much hath been written by each of you, in support of your different opinions, that no new light can be thrown upon the subject.

A more powerful motive would have prevented me from intruding an opinion, or offering any remarks at this particular juncture, which is, that this important subject is under consideration and enquiry of the Legislature. They have both the means and the ability of investigating it fully; and though at those tribunals it must meet with a dispassionate and unprejudiced hearing, yet while any remarks are ushered into the world, which have an evident tendency to bias the mind against the conduct of the Governor General, it is a duty his friends owe to him, to endeavour to obviate their bad effects. I shall therefore proceed to remark on some of the facts stated in your pamphlet.

You say, pa. 11, "Within a year after the arrival of General Clavering, Colonel Monson, and Mr. Francis, in Bengal, a bonded debt of a hundred and ten lacks was paid off; and from the year 1775 to 1780, above a hundred and ten lacks per annum, one year with another, was allotted and paid to the Commercial Board, out of the territorial revenues, for the purchase of an investment for the East-India Company."

These words plainly assert, that General Clavering, Colonel Monson, and Mr. Francis, paid off a bonded debt of an hundred and ten lacks; and the implied sense of them is, that the merit of paying off this debt is due solely to these three gentlemen; whereas the very reverse is the fact: when Mr. Hastings came to the government, he found a debt existing of above a hundred and twenty lacks of rupees. Previous to the arrival of these three gentlemen, part of this had been paid off, and funds had been provided for the charge of the whole. From these funds the remaining hundred and ten lacks were paid, and to the resources found by him did these gentlemen apply. To him, therefore, and to him alone, is the Company indebted for relieving them from this burthen.

You say, page 47, "For the present opposing one assertion to another, it is sufficient to say, that the merit or demerit of the Maratta war, belongs solely to Mr. Hastings." To this I shall only reply, by saying, that I adopt Mr. Francis's phrase, and re-assert, that the Maratta war is not solely belonging to Mr. Hastings: that if, according to his own argument in the succeeding paragraph, the consent and approbation of a superior power, first had and obtained, constitutes responsibility, it will be found, on enquiry, that Mr. Hastings's assertion is strictly true; on this point, therefore, let issue be joined, whether Mr. Hastings is, or is not, the author of the Maratta war; and as the Secret Committee have this very subject under consideration, with every possible information in their power, it would be both improper and disrespectful to urge the matter any further.

Page 51, line 16, to the end of page 60, you say, "It is of little moment to the present question, whether," &c.

I agreed with you, Sir, that it is of little moment to Mr. Hastings, as a general proposition, whether the conduct of the Presidency of Fort St. George

George towards the Nizam, can be defended or not; but it is very essential to the Governor General, that his conduct and their's should be distinctly marked, and that the consequences of their acts should not be attributed to him. You say, that the Nizam complained of their conduct with reason, it was not, and could not be, the cause of the plan *of the confederacy formed by Nizam Ally Cawn, about the middle of the year* 1779.

The fact is, that the Nizam declared to Mr. John Holland, the Resident at his court, on the 12th of August, 1780, that he had resisted all the attempts made by the Poona Ministry, to induce him to act against us; that the part he *had* taken, was *entirely* owing to the behaviour of the gentlemen of the Madras Presidency.

You proceed to say, "The truth is, that the Nizam's resolution to endeavour to unite all India against the English, took its rise from an act of Mr. Hastings's, in which the interest and safety of the Nizam were much more deeply concerned than they could be by any disposition of the Guntoor Circar, or by the detention of a paltry tribute of three lacks of rupees a year."

You then quote a partial extract from Mr. Elliot's instructions, dated in July, 1778.—Here again, I might with great justice retort your own method of argument, and say, for the present, opposing one assertion to another, "this is not a true state of the case." This, however, is not sufficient for Mr. Hastings's justification, which I may venture to say, will be clearly established whenever this matter is properly enquired into. The Secret Committee will not be satisfied with either your assertion or mine, when they can have more ample information, nor with partial extracts, when they can have the whole records to appeal to. But allow me to say, Sir, that even admitting your premises, which I do not, you have by no means established your conclusion. You must prove, Sir, that these instructions were made known to him, between the end of July 1778, and the middle of the year 1779; you must prove, that from the time he received this knowledge, he entered into the confederacy, and (which is the ground of all proof) that he did really enter into such confederacy —Until you have established these facts, I apprehend your conclusion cannot be admitted; and in the mean time, I will beg leave to inform the public of some circumstances which are strong presumptive proofs, that the Nizam did not know what Mr. Elliot's instructions were, and that he acted the part he did from his resentment of the conduct of the Madras Presidency; and moreover, that you yourself were of that opinion.

In a conference which the Nizam had with Mr. John Holland, he denies having entered into that confederacy which had been reported of him, but justifies the part he had taken against the English on this plan, *The disposition of the Guntoor Circar, and the detention of the Peshcush*; but he does not say a word of the instructions to Mr. Elliot; on the contrary, he speaks in the warmest terms in praise of Mr. Hastings. Supposing with you, that so trifling a thing as this Circar, and so paltry a one as the tribute, could not be the cause of his resentment, when he had a much greater to alledge, is it not very singular, that he should totally omit the mention of this *greater*? Is it not also very singular, that he should speak in terms of respect and confidence, in the justice of Mr. Hastings, whom you alledge to have given him such real cause of offence, and use the language of reproach to the gentlemen of Madras, who, in comparison, had been trifling aggressors?

It appers also very singular, that you, Sir, should now alledge these instructions to have give rise to the Nizam's conduct, when you had, on other

occaſions, cenſured the gentlemen of Madars, for the very conduct which, in your late publication, is evidently palliated, and at *that time* accuſe them of being the author of that reſentment which you now attribute ſolely to Mr. Haſtings. Surely, Sir, you forgot, that in the *unanimous* condemnation of the proceedings relative to the Guntoor Circar, you ſay, (for the paragraph was penned, as I well recollect, by yourſelf) in the letter from Bengal to Fort St. George, of the 14th of February, 1780, that the acts done by that Preſidency, without literally announcing war, tended directly to provoke it, or to render it inevitable.

I have the honour to be,

SIR,

Your moſt obedient humble ſervant,

JOHN SCOTT.

No. 9, *Cockſpur-ſtreet*,
January 24, 1782.

To

To PHILIP FRANCIS, *Eſq.*

SIR,

I SHALL beg leave to offer ſome further remarks upon the facts ſtated in your pamphlet.

Had you thought proper, when you made your appeal to the public, to ſtate facts in a plain, ſimple manner, without perplexing the mind by ſophiſtry, or warping the judgment by miſrepreſentation, I ſhould have had no occaſion to trouble the world with any obſervations; but it is neceſſary both for Mr. Haſtings's honour (which you have ſo publicly called in queſtion) and for the true underſtanding of this ſubject, that the leading facts ſhould be fairly ſtated.

Mr. Barwell, in his minute of the 10th of Auguſt, 1778, did certainly ſtate the unapplied caſh of that day, in the poſſeſſion of Government, to be one hundred and five lacks, twenty thouſand rupees; and when he produced the ſtatement, he particularized at what places, and with whom the amount was depoſited. It was a matter in its nature beyond the reach of cavil, and capable of inſtant proof or detection. It was aſſerted, that the wealth did exiſt at that very time, nor could Mr. Francis deny it.

The balance ſtated by Mr. Haſtings was a computation of what was *expected* to remain at a future day, and being a *contingent* circumſtance, it was inevitably liable to variation. But you have argued on this contingent circumſtance as an abſolute fact, and aſk in a pointed manner, "Is is poſſible that neither the Company nor the Parliament ſhould even aſk what is become of all this money?"

I will not, Sir, trouble the public with a comment upon this diſingenuous method of ſtating an argument, nor the apparent motives of the inſinuation its conveys: but I will take upon me to make a reply to this important queſtion, which you have aſked with ſo much ſeeming exultation.

The Company are poſſeſſed of records which will clearly prove to them and to the Parliament, that the extraordinary public expences which the Governor General has provided for, in the recovery of the Carnatic, in the proviſion of that very inveſtment you boaſt of, in the maintenance of the armies of Bengal, Madras, and Bombay, and in the ſupport of each ſettlement, will fully account for the diſburſement of all the money which has been received in their different treaſuries.

In my laſt letter I hope I have fully proved to whom the merit is due of having paid off the large bonded debt, which exiſted on Mr. Haſtings's acceſſion to the government of Bengal. A month after your arrival in Calcutta, you repreſented the Eaſt-India Company's affairs at that place to be in a ſtate of ruin and decay; that it would be impoſſible longer to conceal or to avert the misfortunes which awaited us; the country was impoveriſhed, the natives were oppreſſed, and even murders had been committed in our moſt populous cities with impunity. You denied the poſſibility of the bonded debt being paid off, either at the time or in the manner in which Mr. Haſtings affirmed it would be diſcharged; yet under *your prudent management* the bonded debt was paid off; and from this ruined and impoveriſhed country, as it appeared to you in 1774, the public gratuitous tribute to Great Britain, under the ſame *prudent management*, was 110 lacks each year, from 1775 to 1780, excluſive of the amount of private fortunes. The following ſtate of facts will prove to whom the credit of increaſing the inveſtment is really due.

You

You arrived in Bengal in October, 1774. The inveſtment ſent home in the ſeaſon of 1774, that is, from May, 1774, to May, 1775, was provided by the money which was advanced between the 1ſt of January, and the 31ſt of December, 1774, from funds eſpecially appropriated for this purpoſe by Mr. Haſtings. The quantity of tonnage taken up by the Company, not being ſufficient for the conveyance of *all* the goods provided in the courſe of the ſeaſon, ending May, 1775, the Governor-General propoſed to engage ſhipping in India to ſupply the deficiency; and the Board of Trade, by urging the great benefit to the Company, of Mr. Haſting's propoſal, and the detriment of keeping the goods rotting in the warehouſes in Bengal, compelled the adoption of the meaſure. The cargo of another ſhip, the Anſon, was ſuperadded to the expectation of the Company that year; ſo that "the gratuitous tribute of Bengal to Great Britain" was increaſed by the prudent management of the Governor-General.

The next year's inveſtment was certainly provided under that adminiſtration in which your caſting voice was deciſive: but it is as certain alſo, that this year the proviſion of goods was increaſed, at the repeated inſtances of the Governor-General, for complying with the demands of the Board of Trade. It is likewiſe a fact, for the truth of which I appeal to the Company's records of that time, that an inveſtment of near 120 lacks of rupees was provided and ſent home that ſeaſon, for which the Company are entirely indebted to Mr. Haſtings, as it was from the funds ſecured by him *antecedently to your arrival*, that this large proviſion was made. In May, 1775, you propoſed to reſtrict the inveſtment of 1775-6 to ſeventy lacks of rupees; but Mr. Haſtings's propoſal for a conſiderable increaſe of the inveſtment was at laſt adopted. At a ſubſequent period, you would have reſtricted the ſupplies to the Board of Trade to eighty or ninety lacks of rupees, and you predicted the ruin of Bengal if they were exceeded. I ſhall not preſume to enter upon the propriety of your reaſoning upon this ſubject.

Mr. Monſon died in 1776; it is therefore as clear as figures can make it, that in this only year of your influence you would have reſtricted "the gratuitous tribute" to ſeventy lacks of rupees.

From the facts ſtated in this letter and my laſt (and I refer to the Company's records for the truth of them) the public will judge to whom the credit is due, of paying off a bonded debt of 120 lacks of rupees, and of allotting 110 lacks, one year with another, from 1775 to 1780, for the purchaſe of an inveſtment; and I truſt they will do that juſtice to a great character, which your late publication tends to deny, and to aſſume to yourſelf.

I have the honour to be,

SIR,

Your moſt obedient humble ſervant,

JOHN SCOTT.

No. 9, Cockſpur-ſtreet,
1ſt Feb. 1782.